#### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY To: WRITTEN OPINION OF THE see form PCT/ISA/220 INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing 28.11.05 not is (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet) Applicant's or agent's file reference FOR FURTHER ACTION see form PCT/ISA/220 See paragraph 2 below Priority date (day/month/year) International filing date (day/month/year) International application No. 28.01.2004 20.01.2005 PCT/EP2005/000544 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G01D11/00, G01F23/26, G11B33/00 VEGA GRIESHABER KG This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Basis of the opinion Box No. Ⅰ ☑ Box No. II Priority Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability ☐ Box No. III Lack of unity of invention ☐ Box No. IV Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial Box No. V applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Certain documents cited ☐ Box No. VI ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application **FURTHER ACTION** If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. **Authorized Officer** Name and mailing address of the ISA:

Kallinger, C

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-8086

European Patent Office

Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d

D-80298 Munich

# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/EP2005/000544

_			APRO REGIONALE SE	
_	Box No. I Basis of the opinion			
1.	With	With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.		
		lan	s opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following guage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search der Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).	
2.	With	lith regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and ecessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:		
	a. t	ype	pe of material:	
	i		a sequence listing	
	1		table(s) related to the sequence listing	
	b. f	format of material:		
			in written format	
			in computer readable form	
	c. time of filing/furnishing:		of filing/turnishing:	
			contained in the international application as filed.	
			filed together with the international application in computer readable form.	
			furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.	
3	In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.			
4	4. Additional comments:			
_	Box No. II Priority			
1	. 🗵	d	he validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority oes not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where equired, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the ssumption that the relevant date (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.	
2	2. 🗆	h	his opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim as been found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international ling date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.	
;	3. A	dditi	onal observations, if necessary:	

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

1-11,13-17,19-22

No: Claims

12,18

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-22

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims No: Claims 1-22

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet



# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/EP2005/000544

#### Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US-A-4 737 787 (ITO ET AL) 12 April 1988

D2: DE 196 06 747 A1 (SCHARCO ELEKTRONIK GMBH & CO KG, 42277 WUPPERTAL, DE) 28 August 1997

D3: DE 299 03 260 U1 (SIEMENS AG) 13 April 2000

D4: DE 101 13 646 A1 (ABB RESEARCH LTD., ZUERICH) 26 September 2002

D5: US-B1-6 402 031 (HALL DONALD R) 11 June 2002

D6: DE 39 15 456 A1 (HERION-WERKE KG, 7012 FELLBACH, DE) 15 November 1990

## Independent claim 1 - Lack of inventive step

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

The document D1 is regarded as being the closest prior art to the subject-matter of claim 1, and discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) a power supply device (fig. 1, no. 5) wherein the power supply device is adapted to be disposed and connected electrically between the display and adjustment unit (fig. 1, no. 2 and 3 and column 3, lines 18-19) and the low power sensor unit (fig. 1, no. 1 and column 1, lines 15-17), enabling for the display and adjustment unit and the low power sensor unit to be energized simultaneously and enabling data communication between the display and adjustment unit and the low power sensor unit (see fig. 1, no. 6 and column 2, line 46 to column 3, line 35).

The subject-matter of claim 1 therefore differs from this known device in that its components are modular.

PCT/EP2005/000544

The device proposed in claim 1 of the present application cannot be considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) for the following reason:

A modular construction of sensor devices is generally known to the person skilled in the art as being advantageous (see e.g. D2 - D5). Especially in view of the in D1 described different separate "units", the skilled person would therefore regard it a normal design procedure realize these units as separated modules.

### Independent claims 12 and 18 - Lack of inventive step

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of independent claims 12 and 18 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

The document D5 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document): a modular measuring system (see fig. 1) comprising

- a sensor unit (101)
- a display and control unit (103) and
- a power supply device (104) energizing the other modules,

that are detachably connectable to each other and which are adapted to be brought into an electrical contact with each other.

D5 describes a wide variety of sensors and power supply choices (see column 12, lines 56-65). Therefore the skilled person would regard it a normal design procedure to apply this modular design also to low power sensors.

#### Dependent claims

The respective dependent claims do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step. From the cited documents D1 to D6 the claimed features are either known or relate only to slight constructional changes which come within the scope of the customary practice followed by persons skilled in the art, especially as the advantages thus achieved can be readily contemplated in advance.